

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3 and 5 are amended. Claim 10 is cancelled. Claims 1-9 and 11 are pending.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as being indefinite. Claim 11 is amended in light of the remarks of the Office Action to more clearly define the invention. Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,375,608 to Thompson (“Thompson”) or U.S. Patent No. 3,205,541 to Beards (“Beards”). Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments above and the remarks below.

All of independent claims 1, 3 and 5 are amended to more clearly indicate that the claimed baffle extends along less than half the length of the body of the claimed glass holder or slat holder. As is clearly shown in, for example, Figs. 1, 2 and 4 and the corresponding text of Thompson, wiper blade 10 extends along an entire length of end fitting 3. Similarly, in Beards protuberances 125 extend along substantially an entire length of end frame 12 – as is clearly shown in, for example, Fig. 4 of Beards.

In jalousie windows, blade holders are driven by actuating rods at a hub. Any friction generated by wiping seals (such as the wiper blade in Thompson or the protuberances in Beards) along the length of each holder must be overcome through the mechanical disadvantage of the hub driven system. Moreover, as multiple holders are normally driven off one actuating handle, the force required to operate a system with these frictional issues becomes a practical impossibility. In the prior art references to Beards and Thompson, with wiper blade 10 and protuberance 125 extending along substantially the entire length of end fitting 3 and frame 12 respectively, such frictional issues arise and it becomes very difficult to operate the hub and open and close the respective windows.

In contrast, by designing a baffle extending along less than the length of the body of a glass or slot holder, the baffle avoids such frictional issues. This can be seen, for example, in Fig. 1 of the present specification. A user can open a window in accordance with the invention and baffles 7 will have no contact with channel 1 except in the “closed” position thereby overcoming the disadvantages of the prior art. As such, it is asserted that independent claims 1, 3 and 5 include limitations which are not shown in either the Thompson or Beards references. Dependent claims 2, 4, 6-9 and 11 include the above referenced limitations of independent

claims 1, 3 and 5 respectively and include additional recitations which, when combined with limitations of independent claims 1, 3 and 5, are also neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record. It is asserted that these claims are patentable as well. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully requested in light of the remarks above.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on April 3, 2006:

Respectfully submitted,

Max Moskowitz
Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

April 3, 2006
Date of Signature

Max Moskowitz
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

MM:SSR:bar